

Late-time phantom universe in $SO(1,1)$ dark energy model with exponential potential

Yi-Huan Wei^{1,2}

¹ *Department of Physics, Bohai University,
Jinzhou 121000, Liaoning, China and*

² *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100080, China*

Abstract

We discuss the late-time property of universe and phantom field in the $SO(1,1)$ dark energy model for the potential $V = V_0 e^{-\beta\Phi^\alpha}$ with α and β two positive constants. We assume in advance some conditions satisfied by the late-time field to simplify equations, which are confirmed to be correct from the eventual results. For $\alpha < 2$, the field falls exponentially off and the phantom equation of state rapidly approaches -1 . When $\alpha = 2$, the kinetic energy ρ_k and the coupling energy ρ_c become comparable but there is always $\rho_k < -\rho_c$ so that the phantom property of field proceeds to hold. The analysis on the perturbation to the late-time field Φ illustrates the square effective mass of the perturbation field is always positive and thus the phantom is stable. The universe considered currently may evade the future sudden singularity and will evolve to de Sitter expansion phase.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq, 98.80.Hm

The accelerated expansion of the universe [1] indicates the existence of energy component with big negative pressure, dark energy [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], which weakly interacts with ordinary matter. The current observations [7, 8] hint that dark energy may likely possess a super-negative pressure, $w_X < -1$, i.e., phantom [9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. There are at least the two classes of phantom models, one characterized by the equation of state $p_X = w_X \rho_X$, others satisfying some different equation of state such as Chaplygin gas [5]. For the first class, a special case is that w_X is a constant, in which a Big Rip occurs [9, 10]. Phantom violates the weak energy condition, but it may be stable providing that the second derivative of potential with respect to field is negative [17, 18]. Phantom particle may be allowed by conventional kinematics, ordinary particles can decay into heavier particles plus phantoms [17]. Compared with the age of the universe, if phantom particle's life is long enough, then it can also be thought to be stable.

Either a phantom universe may evolve to or avoid the future singularity depends on the used model. For the generalized Chaplygin gas as phantom, the universe may avoid Big Rip [19]. Quantum phantom effects may evade the occurrence of singularity since the universe may end up in de Sitter phase before scale factor blows up [20]. In a higher-derivative scalar-tensor theory, the universe can admit an effective phantom description with a transient acceleration phase [21]. For an overall phantom expansion phase with $p_X = w_X \rho_X$, what about this case? For a constant w_X , there is the scale factor $a \sim [-w_X t_m + \gamma_X t]^{2/3\gamma_X}$ with $\gamma_X = 1 + w_X$, which implies a Big Rip will occur in a finite time. Here, we consider the case of time-dependent w_X . Treating it as the approximate expression to a for a changing w_X , then we conjecture for $\gamma_X = -Wt^{-n}$ with $W > 0$ and $n > 1$ two constants, $|\gamma_X t| = Wt^{1-n}$ decreases with time so that the universe, as pointed out in [23], may escape future Big Rip. For an exponentially evolving $\gamma_X \sim -e^{\sigma t}$ with σ a negative constant, $|\gamma_X t|$ may diminish with time more rapidly than the power-law one mentioned above for late time, so one can conjecture in this case the universe can also avoid future sudden singularity.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the problem of the avoidance of Big Rip in the context of $SO(1,1)$ model. We find this model can give a distinctive description for the phantom field and the universe due to existence of the symmetry. We consider the case of the potential $V(\Phi) = V_0 e^{-\beta \Phi^\alpha}$ with $\alpha \leq 2$ and analyze the properties of the late-time field the universe. For this exponential potential, the late-time field Φ exponentially decreases to zero, the scale factor a exponentially increases and the equation of state tends to -1 . A

simple analysis on the perturbation of field shows the late-time phantom is stable and the universe can evade a Big Rip.

Before analyzing the late-time evolution of phantom field and universe, we give a simple discussion of $SO(1,1)$ model. This model contains two field components, ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , or equivalently, Φ and θ . For late time, the matter density is much smaller than phantom energy density and equations (6)-(11) given in Ref. [23] reduce to

$$H^2 = \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho_\Phi, \quad \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho_\Phi + 3p_\Phi), \quad (1)$$

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} + \dot{\theta}^2\Phi + V'(\Phi) = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{\theta} = \frac{c}{a^3\Phi^2}, \quad (3)$$

$$\rho_\Phi = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\Phi}^2 - \Phi^2\dot{\theta}^2) + V(\Phi), \quad p_\Phi = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\Phi}^2 - \Phi^2\dot{\theta}^2) - V(\Phi). \quad (4)$$

where c is a constant.

Noting that $\ddot{\theta} = -(2\frac{\dot{\Phi}}{\Phi} + 3H)\dot{\theta}$ and $\dot{\rho}_\Phi = \dot{\Phi}\ddot{\Phi} + \Phi\dot{\Phi}\dot{\theta}^2 + 3H\Phi^2\dot{\theta}^2 + V'\dot{\Phi}$, then one can find (2) will yields

$$\dot{\rho}_\Phi + 3H(\rho_\Phi + p_\Phi) = 0. \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) implies that (2) plays practically the role of the conserved equation in $SO(1,1)$ dark energy model.

The exponential potential has greatly been studied in quintessence, phantom and other models [22]. For the Gaussian potential, $V = V_0 e^{-\Phi^2/\sigma^2}$, a numerical analysis shows that the phantom universe will evolve regularly [17]. Here, for $SO(1,1)$ model we consider the following exponential potential

$$V = V_0 e^{-\beta\Phi^\alpha}, \quad (6)$$

where α and β are two positive constants. For potential (6), there are two possible cases for the late-time evolution of field, Φ increases or decreases with time. We suppose the field should decrease with time and assume the field satisfies the following condition in advance

$$\dot{\theta}^2\Phi^2 \gg \dot{\Phi}^2, \quad \dot{\theta}^2\Phi \gg \ddot{\Phi}, \quad \dot{\theta}^2\Phi \gg 3H\dot{\Phi}. \quad (7)$$

Letting

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} = \eta_1 \dot{\theta}^2 \Phi, \quad (8)$$

where $\eta_1 = \eta_1(t)$ is a small quantity and putting (3) and $V' = -\alpha\beta\Phi^{\alpha-1}V$ in (2), then we have

$$\frac{c^2(1+\eta_1)}{a^6\Phi^3} - \alpha\beta\Phi^{\alpha-1}V = 0, \quad (9)$$

which yields

$$a = A^{\frac{1}{6}}\Phi^{\frac{-\alpha-2}{6}}e^{\beta\Phi^\alpha/6}, \quad A = \frac{c^2(1+\eta_1)}{\alpha\beta V_0}. \quad (10)$$

Eq. (10) shows the simple relation between a and Φ , from which the Hubble parameter may be expressed in terms of Φ and η_1 as

$$H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = \frac{1}{6}[(1+\eta_1)^{-1}\dot{\eta}_1 - (\alpha+2)\Phi^{-1}\dot{\Phi} + \alpha\beta\Phi^{\alpha-1}\dot{\Phi}], \quad (11)$$

in which the first term on the right-hand side is small quantity.

Defining the kinetic energy and the coupling energy as

$$\rho_k = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2, \quad \rho_c = -c^2\Phi^{-2}a^{-6}, \quad (12)$$

and letting

$$\rho_k = -\eta_2\rho_c, \quad (13)$$

where $\eta_2 = \eta_2(t)$ is also a small quantity, then the total energy density is

$$\rho_\Phi = \rho_k + \rho_c + V = [1 - \frac{1-\eta_2}{1+\eta_1}\alpha\beta\Phi^\alpha]V, \quad (14)$$

where $\Phi \leq [\frac{1-\eta_2}{1+\eta_1}\alpha\beta]^{-1/\alpha} \simeq (\alpha\beta)^{-1/\alpha}$ which guarantees positivity of ρ_Φ , noting that η_1 and η_2 are two small quantities. From Eqs. (1) and (11), dropping the first term on the right-hand side of the latter we have

$$\frac{1}{6}[\alpha\beta\Phi^{\alpha-1} - (\alpha+2)\Phi^{-1}]\dot{\Phi} \simeq \mu_P^{-1}\rho_\Phi^{1/2}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mu_P^2 = 3M_P^2$ with $M_P = 1/\sqrt{8\pi G}$ is the reduced Planck mass. As the phantom solution of (15), ρ_Φ must increase with time, this implies Φ should diminish with time. Assuming that

$\Phi \ll (\alpha\beta)^{1/\alpha}$ and $\Phi \ll (\beta)^{1/\alpha}$ for $t \gg 1$, then there are $e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}\Phi^\alpha} \simeq 1$ and $\rho_\Phi \simeq V_0$; neglecting the first term on the left-hand, approximately to the lowest order then (15) reduces to

$$-\frac{\alpha+2}{6}\Phi^{-1}\dot{\Phi} \simeq \mu_P^{-1}\sqrt{V_0}. \quad (16)$$

Solving (16) and putting Φ in (10), then we obtain

$$\Phi = \Phi_0 e^{-\frac{6\sqrt{V_0}}{\mu_P(\alpha+2)}t}, \quad a = a_0 e^{\frac{\sqrt{V_0}}{\mu_P}t} e^{\frac{\beta}{6}\Phi^\alpha}, \quad (17)$$

where Φ_0 is a constant and $a_0 = A^{\frac{1}{6}}\Phi_0^{-\frac{\alpha+2}{6}}$. Eq. (17) shows Φ fall exponentially off and the Hubble parameter approaches $H_m = \frac{\sqrt{V_0}}{\mu_P}$.

Expanding $\sqrt{1 - \frac{1-\eta_2}{1+\eta_1}\alpha\beta\Phi^\alpha} \simeq 1 - \frac{1-\eta_2}{2(1+\eta_1)}\alpha\beta\Phi^\alpha$, $e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}\Phi^\alpha} \simeq 1 - \frac{\beta}{2}\Phi^\alpha$ and letting $\chi = (\alpha+2)[\frac{1-\eta_2}{1+\eta_1}\alpha+1] - 2\alpha$ which is a slowly-changing function and thus is treated as a constant here, then Eq. (15) gives

$$-\frac{1}{12}[2(\alpha+2)\Phi^{-1} - \chi\beta\Phi^{\alpha-1}]\dot{\Phi} \simeq H_m, \quad (18)$$

which yields

$$\Phi e^{\frac{\chi\beta}{2\alpha(\alpha+2)}\Phi^\alpha} = \Phi_0 e^{-\frac{6}{\alpha+2}H_m t}, \quad (19)$$

or approximately

$$\Phi \simeq \Phi_0 e^{-\frac{6}{\alpha+2}H_m t} - \frac{\chi\beta}{2\alpha(\alpha+2)}\Phi_0^{\alpha+1} e^{-\frac{6(\alpha+1)}{\alpha+2}H_m t}. \quad (20)$$

Putting (20) in (6) and (10) yields the late-time scale factor and the potential

$$a \simeq a_0 \left[1 + \frac{(2\alpha+\chi)\beta\Phi_0^\alpha}{12\alpha} e^{-\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha+2}H_m t}\right] e^{H_m t}, \quad (21)$$

$$V \simeq V_0 e^{-\beta\Phi_0^\alpha} e^{-\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha+2}H_m t} \simeq V_0 (1 - \beta\Phi_0^\alpha e^{-\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha+2}H_m t}). \quad (22)$$

In deriving (20)-(22), the condition (7) has been assumed. A check for it must be done. Holding η_1, η_2 but neglecting their derivatives with respect to time, then we obtain

$$\rho_k = \frac{18\Phi_0^2}{(\alpha+2)^2} H_m^2 e^{-\frac{12}{\alpha+2}H_m t}, \quad \rho_c = -\frac{\alpha\beta}{1+\eta_1} \Phi_0^\alpha V_0 e^{-\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha+2}H_m t}, \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{\theta}^2 \Phi = \frac{\alpha\beta}{1+\eta_1} \Phi_0^{\alpha-1} V_0 e^{-\frac{6(\alpha-1)}{\alpha+2}H_m t}, \quad (24)$$

$$\ddot{\Phi} = \frac{36}{(\alpha+2)^2} H_m^2 \Phi_0 e^{-\frac{6}{\alpha+2} H_m t}, \quad 3H\dot{\Phi} = -\frac{18}{\alpha+2} H_m^2 \Phi_0 e^{-\frac{6}{\alpha+2} H_m t}, \quad (25)$$

which clearly satisfy (7) for $\alpha < 2$. From (23)-(25), for $\alpha < 2$ the two small quantities η_1 and η_2 are determined as

$$\eta_1 \simeq -\frac{6\Phi_0^{2-\alpha}}{(\alpha+2)^2 \beta M_P^2} e^{\frac{6(\alpha-2)}{\alpha+2} H_m t}, \quad \eta_2 \simeq \frac{6\Phi_0^{2-\alpha}}{\alpha(\alpha+2)^2 \beta M_P^2} e^{\frac{6(\alpha-2)}{\alpha+2} H_m t}, \quad (26)$$

which implies the fact that χ is indeed a slowly-changing quantity. In deriving (26), $H_m^2 = V_0/\mu_P^2$ and $\mu_P^2 = 3M_P^2$ have been used. From (22) and (23), barotropic index $\gamma_\Phi = 1 + w_\Phi = \frac{2(\rho_k + \rho_c)}{\rho_k + \rho_c + V}$ is given as

$$\gamma_\Phi = -\frac{2\alpha\beta}{1+\eta_1} \Phi_0^\alpha e^{-\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha+2} H_m t} + \frac{12\Phi_0^2}{(\alpha+2)^2 M_P^2} e^{-\frac{12}{\alpha+2} H_m t}, \quad (27)$$

which shows γ_Φ decreases exponentially to zero and thus implies the universe will approach the de Sitter phase with H_m the expansion rate.

For $\alpha = 2$, the condition (7) is no longer true. However, the results (20)-(25) and (27) are still correct, this may be seen from the process of obtaining them and the fact that η_1, η_2 are two finite constants. For $\alpha = 2$, (22)-(25) gives rise to

$$\rho_k = \frac{3\Phi_0^2 V_0}{8M_P^2} e^{-3H_m t}, \quad \rho_c = -\frac{2\beta\Phi_0^2 V_0}{1+\eta_1} e^{-3H_m t}, \quad V = V_0(1 - \beta\Phi_0^2 e^{-3H_m t}), \quad (28)$$

which shows ρ_k and ρ_c fall off according to the same exponential law, and

$$\dot{\theta}^2 \Phi = \frac{2\beta\Phi_0 V_0}{1+\eta_1} e^{-3H_m t/2}, \quad \ddot{\Phi} = \frac{3\Phi_0 V_0}{4M_P^2} e^{-3H_m t/2}, \quad 3H\dot{\Phi} = -\frac{3\Phi_0 V_0}{2M_P^2} e^{-3H_m t/2}. \quad (29)$$

Using $\ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} = \eta_1 \dot{\theta}^2 \Phi$ and $\rho_k = -\eta_2 \rho_c$, then from (28) and (29) it follows

$$\frac{1+\eta_1}{2\beta\eta_1} = -\frac{4}{3} M_P^2, \quad \frac{1+\eta_1}{2\beta\eta_2} = \frac{8}{3} M_P^2, \quad (30)$$

which yield

$$\eta_1 = -\frac{3}{3+8\beta M_P^2}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{3}{2(3+8\beta M_P^2)}. \quad (31)$$

Importantly, Eq. (31) tells $\eta_2 < \frac{1}{2}$, this means that for the exponential potential (6) with $\alpha \leq 2$, the model always has the late-time phantom property.

Here, we give a simple analysis on the stability. For simplicity, assuming that the fluctuations of the field θ and the background may be neglected, taking the perturbation to the

field Φ as $\delta\Phi = \sum \delta\Phi_k(t)e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}}$, where k denotes the mode with energy k , then the evolution of perturbation field $\delta\Phi$ is determined by

$$\delta\ddot{\Phi}_k(t) + 3H\delta\dot{\Phi}_k(t) + (V'' + \dot{\Theta}^2 + k^2)\delta\Phi_k(t) = 0, \quad (32)$$

where V'' denotes the second order derivative with respect to Φ . From Eqs. (2), (6) and (8) it follows that $V'' = [\alpha\beta(1 - \alpha)\Phi^{\alpha-2} + \alpha^2\beta^2\Phi^{2\alpha-2}]V$ and $\dot{\Theta}^2 = \frac{\alpha\beta}{1+\eta_1}\Phi^{\alpha-2}V$. The effective mass of $\delta\Phi$ is given by

$$m_{eff}^2 = V'' + \dot{\Theta}^2 + k^2 = \alpha\beta(1 + \frac{1}{1+\eta_1} - \alpha)\Phi^{\alpha-2}V + \alpha^2\beta^2\Phi^{2\alpha-2}V + k^2. \quad (33)$$

Eq. (33) shows the effective mass of the perturbation field differs from that given in [17, 18], the obvious distinctions between them are the positive sign of V'' and existence of the positive term $\dot{\Theta}^2$ which can strength the stability of the field. Noting that $V \simeq V_0$ for late time and η_1 and Φ are small quantity for $\alpha < 2$, then there approximately is $m_{eff} = [\alpha\beta(2 - \alpha)V_0\Phi^{\alpha-2}]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ which depends on time and is large. For $\alpha = 2$, inserting $\eta_1 = -\frac{3}{3+8\beta M_P^2}$ in (33) leads to $m_{eff} = [\frac{3V_0}{4M_P^2} + k^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It is clear that for $\alpha \leq 2$, m_{eff} is always real for both $V'' < 0$ and $V'' > 0$ so that the amplitude of the perturbation may always be suppressed on both small and large scale and thus the phantom field Φ in the potential (6) with $\alpha \leq 2$ is stable for late time.

The $SO(1,1)$ model may be obtained by the substitution $Q \rightarrow ic$ from the $U(1)$ model, a generalization to quintessence [6], and it can be considered as either the quintessence or phantom model. Compared with the phantom model given from quintessence by $\phi \rightarrow i\phi$, the $SO(1,1)$ phantom model contains an extra negative coupling energy, so it certainly possesses some different properties and may be expected to give a distinct description for phantom. We have studied the late-time evolution properties of the universe and the field for the exponential potential. In this model, the late-time universe and field appears some distinctive features. Compared with the coupling energy, the kinetic energy of the late-time field is a small quantity for $\alpha < 2$. Unlike the phantom with negative kinetic energy, it is the case that negative coupling energy exceeds positive kinetic energy results in the super-negative pressure and therefore the behavior of field is quite different from that in the former phantom model. In the former model, stability on the large scale requires $V'' < 0$, however, in the latter no constraint on the potential from stability is needed. The universe driven by the $SO(1,1)$ phantom with the exponential potential can avoid a future Big Rip and will evolve to the approximate de Sitter expansion phase.

Acknowledgement: This work are supported by ITP Post-Doctor Project 22B580, Chinese Academy of Science of China, National Nature Science Foundation of China and Liaoning Province Educational Committee Research Project.

-
- [1] A.G. Riess et al., *Astron. J.* , **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter et al., Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration, *Astrophys. J.*, **517**, 565 (1999); P.M. Garnavich et al., *Astrophys. J.*, **493**, L53 (1998); Spergel, D. N. et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003).
 - [2] B. Rathra, P.J.E Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988); R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998); N. Bahcall, J.P. Ostriker, S. Perlmutter and P.J. Steinhardt, *Science* **284**, 1481 (1999); T.D. Saini, S. Raychaudhury, V. Sahni and A.A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1162 (2000); M. Sami and T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 083509 (2003).
 - [3] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov, P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 103510 (2001); T. Chiba, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 063514 (2002); V. Barger, D. Marfatia, *Phys. Lett. B***498**, 64 (2041).
 - [4] M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami, A.A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 062511 (2003); Y.S. Piao, R.G. Cai, Q.G. Huang, X.M. Zhang and Y.Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 121301 (2002).
 - [5] A. Y. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella and V. Pasquier, *Phys. Lett. B* **511**, 265 (2001); M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami, A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043507 (2002); *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043507 (2002); L.P. Chimento, A.S. Jakubi, D. Pavon , *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 087302 (8073).
 - [6] L. Boyle, R. R. Caldwell and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 17 (2002).
 - [7] A.G. Riess, et al., *Astrophys. J.*, **607**, 665 (2004).
 - [8] Y. Wang, M. Tegmark, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 241302 (2004).
 - [9] R.R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski, N.N. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 071301 (2003).
 - [10] B. McInnes, *JHEP* **0208** (2002) 029 [arXiv:hep-th/0112066].
 - [11] J.D. Barrow, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, L79 (2004).
 - [12] A. E. Schulz, M. White, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 043514 (2001); J.g. Hao, X.z.. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 107303 (2003); **68**, 043501 (2003); S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B***571**, 1 (2003);

- Phys. Lett. B* **562**, 147 (2003); arXiv:hep-th/0408170; A. E. Schulz, M. White, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 043514 (2001); L. P. Chimento, and R. Lazkoz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 211301 (2003); P. Singh, M. Sami, N. Dadhich, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023522 (2003); E.V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 023511 (2004); H. Q. Lu, arXiv:hep-th/0312082; V.B. Johri, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 041303 (2004); M.P. Dabrowski, T.Stachowiak, M.Szydlowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 103519 (2003); E. Elizalde, J.E. Lidsey, S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **574**, 1 (2003); Z.-K. Guo, Y.-S. Piao, Y.-Z. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **594** 247 (2004); M. Szydlowski, W. Czaja, A. Krawiec, arXiv:astro-ph/0401293; V. Faraoni, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 123520 (2004); L.P. Chimento, R. Lazkoz, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **19**, 2479 (2004); V.K. Onemli, R.P. Woodard, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 107301 (2004); J.M. Cline, S. Jeon, G.D. Moore, arXiv:hep-ph/0311312; W. Fang, H.Q. Lu, Z.G. Huang, K.F. Zhang, hep-th/0409080; L.P. Chimento, R. Lazkoz, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **19**, 2479 (2004)[gr-qc/0405020]; C. Csaki, N. Kaloper, J. Terning, astro-ph/0409596.
- [13] P.F. Gonzalez-Diaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 063522 (2004); P.F. Gonzalez-Diaz, *Phys. Lett. B* **586**, 1 (2004); P.F. Gonzalez-Diaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103512 (2004); P.F. Gonzalez-Diaz, hep-th/0408225.
- [14] M. Sami, A. Toporensky, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **19**, 1509 (2004).
- [15] M.C.B. Abdalla, Shin'ichi Nojiri, Sergei D.Odintsov, hep-th/0409177.
- [16] A. Lue, G.D. Starkman, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 101501 (2004) [astro-ph/0408246].
- [17] S.M. Carroll, M. Hoffman, M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023509 (2003).
- [18] R.R. Caldwell, *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 23 (2002).
- [19] P.F. Gonzalez-Diaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 021303 (2003); M. Bouhmadi-Lopez, J.A. Jimenez Madrid, arXiv:astro-ph/0404540; S.K. Srivastava, astro-ph/0407048.
- [20] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **595**, 1 (2004).
- [21] E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043539 (2004).
- [22] A.R. Liddle and R.J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 023509 (1999); P.J. Steinhardt, L. Wang and I. Zlatev, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 123504 (1999); A. Kehagias and G. Kofinas, gr-qc/0402059; D.F. Torres, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043522 (2002); S.A. Pavluchenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 103518 (2003); X.-z. Li, J.-g. Hao, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 107303 (2004).
- [23] Y.H. Wei, Y. Tian, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21**, 5347 (2004).